

To: 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e (5.1.2e) 5.1.2e @minvws.nl]; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e @minvws.nl]; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e 5.1.2e (5.1.2e) 5.1.2e @minvws.nl]; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e @minvws.nl]; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e @minbuza.nl]; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e (5.1.2e) 5.1.2e @minvws.nl]; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e @minvws.nl]

From: 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e

Sent: Wed 3/31/2021 6:42:47 AM

Subject: RE: Definitieve woordvoeringslijn en Q&A's WHO-rapport

Received: Wed 3/31/2021 6:42:55 AM

Super, dank 5.1.2e De 5.1.2e heeft het setje ook graag compleet allemaal, gelet op mogelijke vragen CHI autoriteiten. Overigens pittig artikel in WSJ, ook voor 5.1.2e geen fijn commentaar, zie geel gearceerd. Vast ook gezien? Voor jullie gemak, zie onderstaand.  
Groetjes, 5.1.2e

## The Wuhan Whitewash

### *A WHO report on Covid's origin echoes Chinese propaganda.*

Editorial

The World Health Organization on Tuesday finally released its report on the origins of the coronavirus, and the result wasn't worth the wait. The document is best understood as a whitewash heavily influenced by the Chinese Communist Party and Westerners with conflicts of interest.

The report—based primarily on an international team's visit this year to the city of Wuhan, where Covid-19 was first detected—has little new information. But the team analyzes four origin scenarios.

The report says the most likely origin was a transfer to humans through bats with an intermediary host. The second most probable, according to the report, is that bats directly transmitted Covid-19 to humans. The report also takes too seriously a third theory, pushed by Beijing, that the virus arrived in China in frozen food, which the WHO claims is “possible” and merits more study.

Most telling is that the team concludes it is “extremely unlikely” that the virus leaked from a lab such as the Wuhan Institute of Virology (WIV). The report simply asserts that WIV facilities “were well-managed, with a staff health monitoring programme.” The report suggests “regular administrative and internal review of high-level biosafety laboratories worldwide” and following up on new evidence.

Yet enough already is known about the WIV to suggest this lacks credibility. In 2018 U.S. officials warned in diplomatic cables about safety and management issues at the WIV that could lead to a pandemic. This is especially troubling because the WIV conducted “gain of function” research on coronaviruses that theoretically can enable them to infect a new species.

The U.S. State Department warned in a January fact sheet that WIV researchers had developed “symptoms consistent with both COVID-19 and common seasonal illnesses” in autumn 2019. The WHO report nonetheless takes the Chinese government at its word when it says there was “no reporting of COVID-19 compatible respiratory illness during the weeks/months prior to December 2019.”

Shi Zhengli of the WIV said last week that the lab has no ties to the Chinese military. But the State Department said in January that “the WIV has collaborated on publications and secret projects with China’s military” for years. The U.S. claims were based on extensive intelligence, and the Biden Administration hasn’t disputed the findings. Did the WHO team even examine U.S. evidence?

The WHO’s tissue-thin analysis isn’t surprising. Chinese government scientists provided most of the data and worked with the international team to craft the report. Beijing has limited independent access to information on Covid-19’s origin, much as it silenced scientists and journalists who raised doubts about the official story last year. The report’s publication was repeatedly delayed, as both sides negotiated a report that is more political than scientific.

The WHO team is also compromised by conflicts of interest. Zoologist Peter Daszak, the American on the team, has collaborated with the WIV for years and supported gain-of-function research. As early as February 2020 he helped coordinate a [statement](#) in the Lancet condemning “conspiracy theories suggesting that COVID-19 does not have a natural origin.” Another team member, virologist 5.1.2e 5.1.2e, oversees an outfit in the Netherlands that has conducted [gain-of-function research and could face serious repercussions if the pandemic started in a lab.](#)

The Biden Administration hasn’t taken a definitive position on the lab-leak theory, but Covid-19 spokesman 5.1.2e 5.1.2e played down the idea last week. Dr. Fauci’s institute financed work at the WIV and has backed gain-of-function research. He’s the wrong man to reassure the public about lab research on coronaviruses.

Dr. Fauci was trying to rebut Robert Redfield, the former chief of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, who said last week that “I still think the most likely etiology of this pathogen in Wuhan was from a laboratory.” Dr. Redfield added that virus transfer to a lab worker is not unusual in such research.

Even the WHO recognizes the implausibility of the report. "I do not believe that this assessment was extensive enough. Further data and studies will be needed to reach more robust conclusions," WHO director-general Tedros Ghebreyesus said Tuesday. "Although the team has concluded that a laboratory leak is the least likely hypothesis, this requires further investigation." He's ready to deploy more specialists, but don't expect Beijing to welcome them.

The U.S. and 13 other governments released a statement Tuesday expressing "shared concerns" that the WHO study "was significantly delayed and lacked access to complete, original data and samples." That's nice, but it sounds like they're prepared to conclude that Covid's origin story is unknowable and move on.

That shouldn't be the end of it. The Biden Administration knows the underlying intelligence and should release it to the public. Unless it does, China's propaganda backed by the WHO's failure will prevail in much of world opinion. The Biden Administration says it wants to revitalize multilateral institutions, and that should start with refusing to accept the WHO's Wuhan whitewash.

**From:** 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e (5.1.2e) <5.1.2e@minvws.nl>

**Sent:** woensdag 31 maart 2021 13:29

**To:** 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@minbuza.nl>; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@minvws.nl>; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e (5.1.2e) <5.1.2e@minvws.nl>; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e (5.1.2e) <5.1.2e@minvws.nl>; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@minbuza.nl>; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e (5.1.2e) <5.1.2e@minvws.nl>; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@minbuza.nl>

**Subject:** RE: Definitieve woordvoeringslijn en Q&A's WHO-rapport

Hi 5.1.2e

Excuus: ik dacht dat duidelijk was dat de statements diezelfde avond online zouden gaan.

Er:

[https://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/un-geneva/95989/local-eu-press-release-who-led-covid-19-origins-study\\_en](https://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/un-geneva/95989/local-eu-press-release-who-led-covid-19-origins-study_en)

USA:

<https://www.state.gov/joint-statement-on-the-who-convened-covid-19-origins-study/>

Sent with BlackBerry Work

([www.blackberry.com](http://www.blackberry.com))

**From:** 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@minbuza.nl>

**Date:** Wednesday, 31 Mar 2021, 3:05 AM

**To:** 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e (5.1.2e) <5.1.2e@minvws.nl>; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@minvws.nl>; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e (5.1.2e) <5.1.2e@minvws.nl>; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e (5.1.2e) <5.1.2e@minvws.nl>; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@minbuza.nl>; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e (5.1.2e) <5.1.2e@minvws.nl>; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@minbuza.nl>

**Subject:** RE: Definitieve woordvoeringslijn en Q&A's WHO-rapport

Veel dank 5.1.2e

We hebben wellicht ook allemaal 5.1.2e gezien gister. En de uitingen van 5.1.2e

Ik heb deze lijn iig alvast gedeeld met 5.1.2e en 5.1.2e

Vraag: is het nu duidelijk wanneer de statements naar buiten gaan? Wellicht heeft 5.1.2e daar een antwoord op?

Verder heb ik afdeling communicatie op de ambassade gevraagd een (social) media analyse te maken. Graag bereid deze te delen, uiteraard.

Groetjes,

5.1.2e

**From:** 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e (5.1.2e) <5.1.2e@minvws.nl>

**Sent:** woensdag 31 maart 2021 03:19

**To:** 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@minvws.nl>; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e (5.1.2e) <5.1.2e@minvws.nl>; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e (5.1.2e) <5.1.2e@minvws.nl>; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@minbuza.nl>; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@minvws.nl>; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e (5.1.2e) <5.1.2e@minvws.nl>; 5.1.2e, 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@minbuza.nl>

**Subject:** FW: Definitieve woordvoeringslijn en Q&A's WHO-rapport

**Importance:** High

Hallo allen,

Com VWS heeft samen met BZ een definitieve woordvoeringslijn opgesteld inzake het uitkomen van het Origins Mission Report vandaag. Zie onder.

Met vriendelijke groet

5.1.2e

Sent with BlackBerry Work

[www.blackberry.com](http://www.blackberry.com)

Verzonden met BlackBerry Work([www.blackberry.com](http://www.blackberry.com))

**Van:** "5.1.2e, 5.1.2e, (5.1.2e)" <5.1.2e @minvws.nl>  
**Verzonden:** 30 mrt. 2021 15:33  
**Naar:** "5.1.2e, 5.1.2e" <5.1.2e @minbuza.nl>; "5.1.2e, 5.1.2e" <5.1.2e @minbuza.nl>; "5.1.2e, 5.1.2e" <5.1.2e @minvws.nl>; "5.1.2e" <5.1.2e @minbuza.nl>; "5.1.2e, 5.1.2e" <5.1.2e @minvws.nl>; "5.1.2e" <5.1.2e @minbuza.nl>; "5.1.2e, 5.1.2e" <5.1.2e @minvws.nl>; "5.1.2e" <5.1.2e @minbuza.nl>; "5.1.2e, 5.1.2e" <5.1.2e @minvws.nl>; "5.1.2e" <5.1.2e @minbuza.nl>; "5.1.2e, 5.1.2e" <5.1.2e @minvws.nl>; "5.1.2e" <5.1.2e @minbuza.nl>; "5.1.2e, 5.1.2e" <5.1.2e @minvws.nl>; "5.1.2e" <5.1.2e @minbuza.nl>  
**Cc:** "5.1.2e, 5.1.2e, (5.1.2e)" <5.1.2e @minvws.nl>  
**Onderwerp:** Definitieve woordvoeringslijn en Q&A's WHO-rapport

Dag allen,

Volgens mij zijn we er dan bijna. Ik zou het volgende willen voorleggen ter akkoord aan mijn minister. Doen jullie hetzelfde aan jullie kant?

En dan is lijn in de woordvoering inderdaad dat inhoudelijke vragen naar ons mogen en de geopolitieke vragen naar jullie.

Groeten 5.1.2e

+++





5.1.2i Concept

---

Help save paper! Do you really need to print this email?

Dit bericht kan informatie bevatten die niet voor u is bestemd. Indien u niet de geadresseerde bent of dit bericht abusievelijk aan u is toegezonden, wordt u verzocht dat aan de afzender te melden en het bericht te verwijderen. De Staat aanvaardt geen aansprakelijkheid voor schade, van welke aard ook, die verband houdt met risico's verbonden aan het elektronisch verzenden van berichten.

This message may contain information that is not intended for you. If you are not the addressee or if this message was sent to you by mistake, you are requested to inform the sender and delete the message. The State accepts no liability for damage of any kind resulting from the risks inherent in the electronic transmission of messages.

---

Help save paper! Do you really need to print this email?

Dit bericht kan informatie bevatten die niet voor u is bestemd. Indien u niet de geadresseerde bent of dit bericht abusievelijk aan u is toegezonden, wordt u verzocht dat aan de afzender te melden en het bericht te verwijderen. De Staat aanvaardt geen aansprakelijkheid voor schade, van welke aard ook, die verband houdt met risico's verbonden aan het elektronisch verzenden van berichten.

This message may contain information that is not intended for you. If you are not the addressee or if this message was sent to you by mistake, you are requested to inform the sender and delete the message. The State accepts no liability for damage of any kind resulting from the risks inherent in the electronic transmission of messages.